

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandran, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/518,447	06/01/2005	Ralf Friedrich	4372-6	7772	
23117 7590 690192008 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			SCHIRO, RYAN RAYMOND		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1792		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/19/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Application No. Applicant(s) 10/518,447 FRIEDRICH ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit RYAN SCHIRO 1792 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2005. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some \* c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/29/2005

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

6) Other:

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

#### DETAILED ACTION

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 13-17, drawn to a composition for the treatment of surfaces, classified in class 525, subclass 328.2.

Group II, claim(s) 18-24, drawn to a process for surface treatment and the deposition of metals, classified in class 427, subclass 430.1.

## PCT:Lack of Unity

## Posteriori

Lack of unity of invention may be may only become apparent "a posteriori," that is, after taking the prior art into consideration, in the case of independent claims to a composition for metal treatment (I) and a process for the treatment and deposition of metals (II) unity of invention (i.e. species) is present a posteriori as the composition is common to all claims.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special Art Unit: 1792

technical features for the following reasons: the special technical feature which is referred to Annex B of Appendix A1 of the MPEP (Administrative Instructions under the PCT,"Unity of Invention"). The express "special technical features" is defined as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art."(Rule 13.2). Unity exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding claimed special technical features. In this case, the technical feature shared by each invention is the composition of polymer, solvent, and other components.

The question of unity of invention has been reconsidered retroactively by the examiner in view of the search performed; a review of Yamada et al. (2003/0104623 A1), makes clear that the inventions of the groups I and II lack the same or corresponding special technical feature because the cited reference(s) appear to demonstrate that the claimed technical feature does not define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. Yamada teaches a polymer with a polyalkylenepolyamine skeleton (0011) which is similar to the composition required by group I, but it is used to introduce a protein into a cell (0010) instead of as a surface treatment for metals, as required by group II. Accordingly, the prior art of the record supports restriction of the claimed subject matter in to the groups as mentioned immediately above.

A telephone call was made to Bryan Davidson on 08/27/2008 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Schiro whose telephone number is 571-270-5345. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vickie Kim can be reached on 571-272-0579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Schiro Art unit 1792

/Michael Barr/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792